BACONIANA

VOL. XXIX. No. 117. October 1945

EDITORIAL NOTES.

IN a letter to the *Literary Times* of 24th February last, Mr. Percy Simpson, of Oriel College, Oxford, points out a contemporary use of, and the explanation of an expression, up till now always considered as a corruption in the text of the Great Folio of Shakespeare and a notable *crux*. The passage occurs in Act V, *Love's Labours Lost*, in a speech of Rosaline:—

> How I would make him fawne and begge and seeke,
> And wait the season, and observe the times,
> And spend his prodigall wits in booteles rimes,
> And shape his service wholly to my device,
> And make him proud to make me proud that jests.
> So *pertaunt* like would I o'ersway his state,
> That he would be my foole, and I his fate.

In John Davies of Hereford's "Wittes Pilgrimage" 1605, in an epigram, "Mortal life compared to Post and Paire," i.e. to the obsolete card game of Post and Pair the same word is found.

After describing how the game fluctuates—a winner losing and recovering—he ends with two stages:

> Pur teit deceives the expectation
> Of him, perhaps, that took the stakes away
> Then to *Purtant* he's in subjection
> For winners on the losers oft do play.

The explanation is obscure, but, as Mr. Simpson says, the word occurs in two different texts which is sufficient evidence of its existence and, not only that, but it can also be explained.

In part two of Randle Holmes' "The Academy of Armory," left in manuscript and not published till 1905, when it was issued to the Roxburghe Club, there are notes on the (terms of) card games used in heraldry; on page 74 this passage occurs:

> A paire is two cards of a sort, as 2 Kings, 2 aces, 2 tens, etc.
> A Paire Royal is 3 cards of a sort.
> A double Paire Royal, or a Paire Taunt, is four cards of a sort.
> Paire-Taunt then means the winning hand in a game of Post and Paire.

This is the point of Shakespeare's "o'ersway his state" and of Davies's "in subjection."

This is one up against the Commentators and "Johnnie Mar-texts."

KING LEAR, ACT IV, SC. 3, IIS., 29-32.

—there she shook
the holy water from her heavenly eyes
with clamour moistened; then away she started
to deal with grief alone.

The whole of this scene describing Cordelia's grief over her father's ill treatment by Regan and Goneril is omitted from the Folio of 1623, but is restored by Pope with the exception of the lines above referred to, which contain the disputed reading, given as "clamour moisten'd." Mr. B. Goulding Brown suggests "dolour master'd," instead of the above reading. However, in *The Literary Times* of 23rd December, 1944, Mr. S. W. Moses upholds the former reading as in the Cambridge Text of 1892. The meaning, he says, seems to be that the outbursts of feeling that grief and indignation forced from her as she read the letter finally gave way to tears. A somewhat similar use of the word "clamour" is made in the player's speech regarding *Hecuba* in Hamlet—"the instant burst of clamour that she made."

We are inclined to agree with Mr. S. W. Moses. (*Times Lit. Sup.*, 24th Feb., 1945.)

CENTENARY OF PUBLICATION OF MRS. COWDEN CLARKE'S CONCORDANCE OF SHAKESPEARE.

According to the Dictionary of National Biography, the first attempt to produce a concordance of Shakespeare was made by Samuel Ayscough and published in 1790, but Mr. W. Parker, in a long and informative article in the *Times Literary Supplement* of 12th May, 1945, points out that a concordance was published anonymously three years earlier, viz., in 1787, compiled by one Andrew Becket, the son of Thomas Becket, a bookseller, and associated with Ralph Griffiths in editing the *Monthly Review*. As a philosophical study of the Shakespeare text, the Francis Twiss' "Complete verbal Index to the plays of Shakespeare," adapted to all editions published in 1805 is to be noted; it has been criticised as not giving sufficient information to the context of the words. The sale price of the book was 63/-.

In 1822 Robert Nares published his "Glossart, or collection of phrases, names—in the works of English Authors—particularly Shakespeare, etc." This book was sold at 55/-.

Comparing the two preceding works, Mr. Parker writes: Twiss' painstaking Index has been consigned to the limbo of neglect; Nare's Glossary, the result of desultory reading, has survived, not only as an important philological performance, but in retrospect as a pointer suggestive to the real Concordance work which was to ensue. A second edition appeared in 1825 and in 1859 an enlarged edition in wo volumes, by Halliwell Wright, and reissued in 1888. On the

occasion of its centenary in 1922 it was remembered and celebrated in the *Times Literary Supplement* of 1st June, 1922.

MRS. COWDEN CLARKE.

It is to Mrs. Cowden Clarke that the honour of completing the first real Concordance belongs. She was the daughter of Vincent Novello and the wife of Charles Cowden Clarke, the friend of Keats, with whom she collaborated in further Shakespeare reference work.

The work, writes Mr. Parker, took root from a chance remark when the Clarkes were on a visit to relations at Standerwick, Somerset, in July, 1829. Regret was then expressed that no Concordance to Shakespeare existed. This statement, though not quite accurate, at once fired Mrs. Clarke with the ambition to undertake the task.

Mrs. Cowden Clarke laboured twelve years at the task and we are told that the last line was written on 17th August, 1841. Four more years were spent in collating with recent editions and revising for the Press.

In case any of our members should be contemplating the much needed Concordance to Francis Bacon's acknowledged writing (Spedding for convenience assembling all the writings in one standard edition) I give a brief description of the method followed by Mrs. Cowden Clarke.

From early morning to late evening she toiled assiduously at the printing premises of Manning & Mason in Ivy Lane.

Providing herself with a portfolio for each alphabetical letter, she took a fresh sheet of paper for each word to be written.

"I worked through two pages of Shakespeare," she said, "as they lay open before me, letter by letter, thus: suppose the top line of the page was 'Angels are bright still, though the brightest fell': I entered the word Angel under its proper head and all the succeeding words beginning with A through the two pages: then 'fell,' and so on until the whole of the two pages were gone through, and then on to two more. At the end of each play I collected all the *filled* pages of the M.S. that my portfolio might be as little loaded as need be; but even with this precaution the bulk in use was very large. However, although the bulk may be increased by using a fresh sheet for each word, yet I think the advantage of clearness thus obtained quite counterbalanced the inconvenience."

For the sake of condensation and clarity she used the nicest discretion in omitting some words and retaining others. Consequently as printing proceeded several thousand lines of MS. were cancelled.

Sympathy and encouragement came to her from many literary men. J. Payne Collier entrusted her with the last volume, then in MS., of his eight volume 1842-44 edition of Shakespeare, so that she might collate his readings and incorporate them into her Concordance before publication. Charles Knight's seven volume issue of 1839-42 was also used for the same purpose. After appearing in 18 monthly

parts during 1844-5, it came out in book form in the latter year.

The book was printed in royal octavo and contained 860 pages of triple-columned lines, giving a total of about 309,000 lines; the price of sale was 46/-.

N.B.—The Editor's copy, printed by W. Kent & Co., Paternoster Row, corresponds in every respect to the above, with the exception of the printer and date of edition, which is 1874.

It should here be noted that the Poet's name is spelled "Shakspere," which is all the more remarkable because the name of the Author, as printed in all the folios which constitute the grand originals, distinctly print the Author's name as "Shakespeare."

To return, however, to the book. In Mrs. Cowden Clarke's own words, she "succeeded in superadding what was defective in my predecessors, Twiss and Ayscough." The book at once took its place as a standard book of reference, and during the next 30 years passed through 10 editions.

So much for the Plays; but in 1866, says the *Times Literary Supplement*, J. O. Halliwell (Phillipps) seems to have been the first compiler to supply a reference to the poems in his "Handbook Index to the works of Shakespeare," etc., of which 50 copies were printed at £3. 3s.

In 1875 Mrs. Horace Howard Furness produced a concordance to Shakespeare's poems; an index to every word therein contained; consisting of 422 double columned pages in royal octavo, at Philadelphia.

Probably the most comprehensive and complete concordance, not even excepting Mrs. Cowden Clarke's, is that produced by John Bartlett, under the title of "A new and complete Concordance or verbal Index to words, phrases and passages in the dramatic works of Shakespeare, with a supplementary Concordance to the Poems." It was published in 1894 by Macmillan & Co., at the price of 42/-, and further editions appeared in 1899 and 1906. The book was a double-columned 4to, with an index to the plays of 1769 pages and one to the poems of 139 pages.

Bartlett spent 18 years in compiling this monumental work which is based on the 1891 edition of the "Globe" Shakespeare.

The most recent Concordance published is one by Cassell & Co., 1938, edited by Burton Stevenson, and based on the text of the revised edition (1911) of the Globe Shakespeare. The lines correspond more or less with "Bartlett's" work, and for the first time prominence was given to unique words and phrases "mostly used only once." The quotations fill 1,759 pages and are followed by the Concordance, which is a word index grouped alphabetically by leading words and then by reference to each quotation by page and its number on that page. The curious reader is referred to the *Times Literary Supplement* of 12th May, from which the foregoing is an extract.

THAT LONG WORD HONORIFICABILITUDINITATIBUS.

We have correspondence from members, but, as no new ground has been broken, we would merely remind our correspondents of the history of the word, which dates back more than 100 years previous to Shakespeare and is to be found in that form, or in a variant form by other writers before him. From this it is obvious that no certainty can be based on any anagram formed from this word, as it was not constructed by Shakespeare and was only adopted by him to suit his particular text. Nevertheless it is not improbable that Shakespeare saw the possibility of making it the cover for an anagram and the enthusiast may exercise his ingenuity in constructing an anagram both grammatical and sensible.

There are several references to this word, together with suggested solutions, in early numbers of BACONIANA. Of these, two are in English and two in Latin. The two English ones are: (1) "Thus I told Franciiiiii (six) Bacon." (2) "Fair vision, Bacon built it, hid it." The two Latin ones are: (1) Hi ludi F. Baconis nati, tuiti orbi, to be translated as "these plays, F. Bacon's off-spring, are preserved for the world." (2) "Hi ludi sibi tuiti, Fr. Bacon's nati," meaning "these plays entrusted to themselves proceeded from Fr. Bacon." There has been some dispute as to the legitimacy of translating tuiti in the manner employed.

In 1910 the late Sir Edwin Durning Lawrence issued a challenge in the Press through the *Pall Mall Gazette*, offering one hundred guineas to anyone who could construct an anagram either in Latin or in English (sensible in its consecutive meaning) out of the long word in L.L.L., which should give the numbers 136 and 151. That is to say, the numerical value of the first and last letters of each word were to count to 136, whilst the total numerical value of the remaining letters were to equal 151. There were a number of responses to the challenge; and the Editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette* obtained the assistance of the Rev. James Gow, LL.D., Headmaster of Westminster School, as umpire.

His dictum was: I regard Sir E. Durning-Lawrence's anagram as not sensible. His Latin words, though each has a meaning, do not make the meaning which he attributes to them or any other meaning.

The only possible translation of "Hi ludi F. Baconis nati tuiti orbi" is these games sons of F. Bacon having protected are orphans." On the same principle he ruled out Mr. Beever's attempt: "It is in nut, I diabolic author fib," as not making a continuous sensible meaning. A Mr. Gilson sent in the following: "I, Jonson, hi libri tui aut ficti a d-." This was ruled out because a final dash was needed to give the meaning required, i.e. "the Devil." The meaning of this ingenious anagram is Go to Jonson; these books are either yours or invented by the D(evil).

The winning anagram was by Mr. Beever, as follows: "Abi inivit F. Bacon histrio ludit," meaning, according to Dr. Gow, "Be off F. Bacon, the actor has entered and is playing." We submit

that, as the words stand, the obvious meaning is "Be off F. Bacon has come in, and the actor is playing." Mr. Beever was allotted the prize and Sir Edwin payed up like a sportsman.

The only comment to make here is that Dr. Gow's pronouncement that "ludi" can only mean "games" is not borne out by Lewis and Short in their big Latin dictionary. Stage plays are a general and special meaning of the word besides "games."

The following anagram also stands: "I iniit F. Bacon. Ubi histrio? ludat," meaning "Go to! F. Bacon has entered; Where is the stage player? Let him act." Alternatively, the little word I may be regarded as an abbreviation for Ipse, meaning Self, in which case it would read: "F. Bacon himself has come in; Where is the player; let him start playing." The above examples demonstrate the difficulties which face the solvers of long anagrams, without the aid of a hint as to the kind of message to be looked for. In this particular case difficulties present themselves on account of the paucity of the letters E, M, or rather of their complete absence, and C, whilst the I is superabundant.

BACON-SHAKESPEARE IN FRANCE.

In the June number of "La France Libre" there is an excellent expose of the Bacon-Shakespeare thesis by "Matila Ghyka."

The writer sets out the case by pointing out the weakness of the case of the man of Stratford and the slenderness of the evidence on which it is based.

The incongruity of his occupations with that of the greatest English Dramatist and Poet is pointed out, viz.:

1. Apprentice to a butcher of Stratford; then a young man holding the horses of the gentry frequenting the theatre; then a strolling player, third rate, if we may accept the records on this point, and also a petty usurer mercilessly pursuing debtors for small sums, and, at the same time, completely devoid of any pretences to education.

2. His sole contemporary, who combined with a poetical genius and an imagination creative both in the domain of ideas and words (the poet author of the dramas created some 7,000 new words), a universal erudition embracing law, medicine, botany, history, natural science, a profound knowledge of Latin and the classical authors, as well as French (and other modern languages); in short, an intimate acquaintance with the psychology of courtiers, their intrigues, genealogies, and other matters connected with the English dynasties—was Francis Bacon.

3. That Francis Bacon was in truth the sole author of the works bearing the name of William Shakespeare.

With regard to the first point, namely, that William Shaksper (with all its variations of spelling) could not have written a line of the Shakespearean canon Baconians (says the writer), furnish arguments which can only be described as overwhelming.

All testimony and documents relating to William Shaksper show him without exception as a merciless and rapacious moneylender like Shylock in *The Merchant of Venice*; not a single letter addressed to him contains the slightest allusion to literature, whilst there is not a single letter from or signed by him in existence. His Will (open to anyone's inspection at Somerset House), drawn up a few weeks before his death in 1616, not only contains no reference to any literary productions or matters connected therewith, such as literary executor, author's rights, etc., all of which is in direct contradiction with his known avarice, his thirst for lucre, revealed in the other documents—but no mention is made of any book belonging to the author of the Will. Yet the Author of *The Tempest*, in the person of Prospero, Duke of Milan, declares that he values more than his dukedom the few books saved from his library. Add to this the testimony of his daughter that her father (William Shaksper of Stratford) did not possess a single book. With such arguments as these the case of the Baconians is more than impressive.

The writer then gives a rapid outline sketch of the career of William of Stratford, as recorded in deeds and documents relating to his Will and purchase and mortgage deeds, of which the signatures have been written in by the law clerks, or perhaps shaky tracings by the illiterate man of Stratford. The next point taken is the publication of the great Folio of the Shakespearean dramas in 1623, which was, and is, the *Editio Princeps*, and must always remain so. This book contained not only all the plays previously published, but plays never before printed, with numerous additions, corrections and revisions of such importance that could only proceed from the Author himself. William Shaksper of Stratford had been dead and buried seven years previously in 1623.

The writer then cites an example of the intimate knowledge of not only the French language but intimate slang. . (See *Henry V*, Act V, Sc. 2). Passing now to proofs positive or presumptive that Francis Bacon was certainly the author of the plays and poems signed William Shakespeare, we will not delay with a discussion as to the reasons why Bacon, if he wrote the plays in which Kings were peremptorily deposed or assassinated, could not acknowledge them without risking his head, we have here no strict proofs but a mass of pointers converging to one direction, such as:

(a) Ben Jonson, writing in the First Folio of 1623, declares that the author topped everything; "of all that insolent Greece or haughty Rome sent forth"—uses in 1641, in his "Discoveries," the same expression to praise Bacon's style, who performed in English "that which may be compar'd or preferr'd either to insolent Greece or haughty Rome."

(b) The Northumberland MS. enumerating amongst its original contents the plays of Richard II and Richard III, besides other acknowledged works of Bacon. There is also written several times over in juxtaposition the names of Francis Bacon and William Shakespeare. Just before the mention of the two Shakespearean Plays

appears the devastating mention "by Mr Ffrancis William Shakespeare".

The writer points out the fact that Bacon was intimately acquainted with Navarre and that *Love's Labour's Lost* reflects his sojourn there as a young man.

In the play of *Henry VIII*, first published in 1623, in the First Folio, Bacon's fall is exactly mirrored forth in the fall of Cardinal Wolsey.

A judicial theory specially dear to Bacon, developed by him in his *History of Henry VII* and in the "De Augmentis," concerning the danger of allowing laws to fall into disuetude without abrogating them is liable to corrupt the application of other laws worthy of being kept on the Statute Book, is expressed in almost the same terms in "Measure for Measure." The writer concludes: "I leave aside the famous Bi-literal cipher discovered by Mrs. Gallup and confirmed by General Cartier (of the Military Cipher Department)."

Such are the arguments which convinced Mr. Agate of the authorship of the Shakespeare plays by Francis Bacon, though we understand that he is now an advocate of collaboration between Bacon and Shaksper.

L.B.

ROYAL COAT OF ARMS IN THE FIRST FOLIO.

In the 1623 Folio there are, as is well known, many mispaginations. One of these occurs at the beginning of *Julius Caesar*, where the numbering begins at page 109, although the last page of the previous play is 98. Between the two plays there is an unnumbered leaf, on one side of which appears THE ACTORS' NAMES. Beneath the list, between two parallel lines, there is a small, but clear, imprint of the Royal Coat of Arms, surmounted by a Crown and encircled by The Garter. The design is supported by two cupids, with floral decoration. The block measures $1\frac{3}{4}$ in. by $\frac{5}{8}$ in. The reverse, page 100, is blank. 100 equals BACON.

My Facsimile is that made by Sir Sidney Lee in 1902, from the Chatsworth copy of the First Folio. I would be glad to know whether the Royal Arms design appears in all copies of the Folio, and what explanation (if any) of its presence has been given by the experts.

M. SENNETT.

BACON'S NEW METHOD RE-EXAMINED.

By W. G. C. Gundry.

(*Continued from page 114*).

The reader may have noticed the quotation from Isaac Pennington, a member of the Society of Friends, which heads this article; it was placed there deliberately as it epitomises the present writer's attempt to point the way towards a possible solution of the problem presented by Bacon's *New Method*. Baconians are familiar with the decorative head pieces, consisting of a large light and dark A[1] which embellish many books contemporary with Bacon; various attempts have been made to explain these, but the present writer suggests that they symbolise the polarity which is everywhere evident in nature: the *ying-yang* signs of the Chinese have a similar significance. It may well be that Bacon had these light and dark A's inserted in the various books with which he was associated, either directly or indirectly, to hint at the secret of his Ladder of the Intellect—his *Scala Intellectus*; that ladder which it was his intention should lead the human mind by progressive stages—from Natural History upwards from truth to truth, from darkness to light, from ignorance to knowledge, thus enabling it to "ascend the brightest heaven of invention." Can it be that Bacon had anticipated modern science, which has now abandoned the mechanistic conception of the universe, prevalent in the Nineteenth Century, and that he contemplated gradual ascents in knowledge from stage to stage, from one apparent reality to the next above it until the limits of investigation were attained or a synopsis of all natures in the universe obtained?

[1]That the letter A, had recondite significance is evident from the words of Jesus found in the *Apocryphal Gospel of Thomas*: "And He looked upon the teacher Zacchaeus, and said to him: Thou who art ignorant of the nature of the *Alpha*, how can'st thou teach others the *Beta*? Thou hypocrite! first, if thou knowest, teach the A, and we shall believe thee about the B. Then He began to question the teacher about the first letter, and he was not able to answer Him. And in the hearing of many, the Child says to Zacchaeus: 'Hear, O teacher, the order of the first letter, and notice how it has lines, and a middle stroke crossing those which thou seest common; (lines) brought together; the highest part supporting them; and again bringing them under one head; with three points (of intersection); of the same kind; principal and subordinate; of equal length. Thou hast the lines of the A.' And when the teacher Zacchaeus heard the Child speaking such and so great allegories of the first letter, he was at great loss about such a narrative, and about his teaching."

' The three lines of the A are explained in the following passage from a Fifteenth Century MS., quoted by Sir John Rhys: 'The three elements of a letter are ⍋, since it is of the presence of one or other of the three a letter consists; they are *three beams of light*, and it is of them are formed the sixteen ogyrvens, that is the sixteen letters. These belong also to another art seven (score) and seven ogyrvens which are no other than the symbols of the rank of the seven score and seven words in the parentage of the Welsh language, and it is from them all other words are derived.' "

Lost Language of Symbolism, Vol. I., Harold Bayley quoting Sir John Rhys (Hibbert Lectures). Italics Bayley's.

Thus by the use of his *Scala Ascensoria et Descensoria Axiomatum* man's understanding was to have been enlightened, as when Jacob beheld the angels of God ascending and descending at Bethel: he was to explore the whole realm of nature towards the ever unattainable *Summa Summarum*, the Apex, as Bacon calls it, of thePyramid.

"To one far off Divine event
To which the whole creation moves."[1]

One of Bacon's injunctions was: "Work as God works." "*O altitudo sapientiae et scientiae Dei! quam incomprehensibilia sunt judicia Ejus, et non investigabiles viae Ejus.*"

It is suggested that the repetition of the acclamations *Sancte, Sancte, Sancte*, point to the threefold nature of creative forces under Divine direction operating in the universe, and that they were purposely inserted in the passage quoted from the Second Book of *The Advancement of Learning*.

Physical phenomena depend on the juxtaposition of two contraries and the consequent opposition results in the emergence of a third manifestation, thus:

Position	Opposition	Composition
Thesis	Antithesis	Synthesis

The Law of Opposition is the fundamental law of thought, just as the Law of Contrast is the secret of all fine expression either in speech or art.[2]

Other triads are:—

Similarity	Contrast	Contiguity
Positive	Comparative	Superlative
Prose	Poetry	Music
Physical	Mental	Spiritual

These may be likened to the *three* stages of knowledge to which Bacon alludes as previously referred to above:

"Holy in the description or dilatation"—position or thesis.
'Holy in the connection or concatenation"—opposition or antithesis.
"Holy in the union of them in a perpetual and uniform law" —composition or synthesis.

In the Third Book of *De Augmentis Scientiarum* Bacon writes: "The object of philosophy is *threefold*—God, Nature and Man; as there are likewise *three* kinds of ray—direct, refracted and reflected. For nature strikes the understanding direct; God, by reason of the unequal medium of His creatures, with a ray refracted; man, as shown and exhibited to himself with a ray reflected. Philosophy may therefore be conveniently divided in *three* branches of knowledge: knowledge of God, knowledge of Nature, and knowledge of Man, or Humanity. But since the divisions of knowledge are not like several

[1] *In Memoriam*, Alfred, Lord Tennyson.
[2] *The Divine Word*, A. E. Ridley.

lines that meet in one angle, but are rather like branches of a tree that meet in one stem (which stem grows for some distance entire and continuous before it divide itself into arms and boughs); therefore it is necessary, before we enter into the branches of the former division, to erect and constitute one universal science, to be as the mother of the rest, and to be regarded in the progress of knowledge as portion of the main and common way, before we come where the ways part and divide themselves. This science I distinguish by the name of *Philosophia Prima*, primitive or summary philosophy; or sapience, which was formerly defined as knowledge of things divine and human."[1]

A little later in the same Book, Bacon notes:—" 'The force of an agent is increased by the reaction of a contrary, is a rule of Physics.' The same has wonderful efficacy in Politics, since every faction is violently irritated by the encroachment of a contrary faction. 'A discord ending immediately in a concord sets off the harmony,' is a rule of Music. The same holds in Ethics and in the affections."

This is known as the doctrine of *Antiperistasis*, that is, of the increase of intensity of one of the two contraries by the juxtaposition of the other.[2] It is conceivable that the opposition of two contraries or unlike aspects of matter might result in a third form of more rarefied multi-dimensional matter, or quasi matter, with functions appropriate to its habitat and subscribing to the *lex loci* of its environment: we might call this localised matter; it may be that the ether, the existence of which is the subject of much discussion, is a form of rarefied matter, or that which we regard as energy, on this particular plane, partakes of the nature of matter on another.

In *The Advancement of Learning* Bacon says: "Nature is collected either into one entire *total*, or else into the same *principle* or *seeds*."[3] And again: "The forms of substances, I say (as they are now by compounding and transplanting multiplied), are so perplexed as they are not to be enquired; no more than it were possible or to the purpose to seek in gross *the forms of those sounds which make words*, which by composition and transposition of letters are infinite. But, on the other side, to enquire *the forms of those sounds or voices which make simple letters* is easily comprehensible, and being known, induceth and manifesteth the form of all words, which consist and are compounded of them."[4]

Bacon insists on the importance of ascertaining the *FORMS* of *Simple Natures* and he expected that when these had been determined and tabulated under his twenty-seven *Prerogative Instances* to make use of his *Ascending and Descending Scale of Axioms*.

Not only this but that the method of *Antiperistasis* might be used

[1] My italics.—W.G.C.G.

[2] The doctrines of *Antiperistasis*: Robertson, note on p. 454. See also Arist. *Prob.* II, 16, and Plutarch's *Quaest Naturales*.

[3] The Advancement of Learning, Book II.

[4] Ibid.

in every field of inquiry, as he indicated it is not only applicable to politics and music, but also to ethics and the affections.[1]

In addition to this primary use of *Antiperistasis* it is possible to conceive it operating in ever ascending planes of rarefied matter[2] or quasi-matter, and producing more and more subtle manifestations of so-called matter, ether, or supernal essence. The world is still in bondage to words and these do not necessarily describe realities but only attempt definition: these are what Bacon calls *Idols of the Market* from which he sought to manumit philosophy, hitherto in the chains of Mediaeval scholasticism. It may be inferred that as new forces are set in motion that which was regarded as an invariable law or axiom will be subject to change or modification: as an instance, the change in the laws governing flight might be cited, where a speed in excess of 747 m.p.h. introduces new problems into aerodynamics. This is the speed of sound.

"Einstein and Eddington formulate matter as a curvature of hypergeometrical space, and say that the curvature broadcasts its effect as gravitation. They contend, not that matter is something producing curvature, but that it *is* that curvature, and that the laws of motion which it follows are appropriate to space-time of many dimensions."[3]

"On the other hand, De Broglie and Schrödinger try to think of the unit of matter, less geometrically and more physically, as akin to a small localised area of group waves, such as can be formed by an assemblage of constituent high-frequency periodicities in a super-dispersive medium wherein wave velocity is a function of wave length."[4]

The three stages of ascent, then, which Bacon enumerates are: *Natural History*, *Physic* (or Physics) and *Metaphysic*; we might call these perhaps, various degrees of differentiated matter or quasi-matter; to each unit of matter its own particular axioms would apply and govern their interactions. Is this Bacon's secret, his *"clavis" "formula," "ars interpretandi"* or *"filum Labyrinthi?"*

In Bacon's "Promus," now in the British Museum, which served as a storehouse for words and phrases, many of which appear in one form or another in the Shakespeare Plays, occurs the cryptic sentence *"Ministerium meum honorificato."* Now the word "ministerium" is a somewhat ambiguous one, as it might imply a mystery, or an occupation. The word "mystery" as applied to the mystery or

[1] *De Augmentis Scientiarum.*

[2] The term "matter" is used for want of a better word; what is in the writer's mind is that essence which is variously named Mula-prakriti, primordial stuff or differentiated matter. W.G.C.G.

[3] *Phantom Walls*, Sir Oliver Lodge, F.R.S.

[4] *Phantom Walls.*

C.f. "Evolution is an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion; during which matter passes from an indefinite homegeneity to a definite heterogeneity and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation."—Herbert Spencer.

miracle plays of the Catholic Church is derived from the Greek musterion (muo, close lips or eyes), while as applied to a craft or occupation, it is derived from the Latin word "ministerium." The two words are sometimes confused. Does not this use of the word, which may in this expression of Bacon's imply a mystery, remind the reader of the words which occur in Ben Jonson's Ode written on the occasion of Bacon's sixtieth birthday:

"Thou stand'st as if a mystery thou didst!"

The ode continues:—

"'Tis a brave cause for joy, let it be known
For 'twere a narrow gladness, kept thine own."

What was the mystery? One might surmise that it was his authorship of the *Shakespeare Plays*, and not only that, but that these magnificent works, great as they are, were part only of his vast philosophic plan and that they were designed to link up with his *Instauratio Magna* and illustrate and emphasise its teachings.

Dr. Theobald, in a fine and illuminating passage, observes: "In the language of mystic philosophy Shakespeare's art is the continent and ultimate of Bacon's philosophy; there is a perfect correspondence and continuity between them. As the natural world is created by influx from the spiritual world, and is its counterpart and representative, so is the poetry of Shakespeare poured forth as influx from the creative thought of Bacon's science, giving to it a concrete presentation, a living organised counterpart."[1]

Father Sutton, S.J., boldly declares: "The plays are Bacon's secret method. The golden thread interlacing and weaving together in innumerable ways the acknowledged works and the Shakespearean is the *Filum Labyrinthi*. The *Comedies*, *Histories* and *Tragedies* are, as some think, the fourth, fifth and sixth parts of the *Instauratio Magna*, or, as others maintain, the fourth part only; while others again connect them with the *Prerogative Instances* of the *Novum Organum*. What a field for research there is here! But while the struggle rages about the authorship at the very entrance of the Labyrinth, the treasures waiting for those who shall succeed in penetrating its inmost recesses cannot enrich the world in all the ways the discoverer and storer of them intended. When students generally recognise the Baconian master-hand in these works, the Baconian mystery will be understood soon after and utilised 'for the glory of the Creator and the relief of man's estate'—the one great end and aim of the *Instauratio Magna*."[2]

It may be asked, where are the fruits of Bacon's philosophy and who has applied his method with success?

Charles Darwin wrote that he had worked on true Baconian

[1] In a review by Father William A. Sutton, S.J., of *Collectanea* by Charles Crawford, Stratford-on-Avon, 1906, quoting Dr. Theobald's *Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light*. BACONIANA (third series) Vol. V, No. 19, July 1907.

[2] Ibid.

principles and, without any theory, collected facts on a wholesale scale.

Sir Harold Spencer Jones, F.R.S., the Astronomer Royal, in recently reviewing the history of the Royal Society by the late Sir Henry Lyons, F.R.S., says: "The New Philosophy refused to accept traditional authority, but aimed at explaining natural phenomena and advancing knowledge by means of observation and experiment"[1]; the very method advocated by Bacon!

Abraham Cowley, in his poem to the Royal Society, paid well deserved tribute to Bacon's inspiration in its foundation, of which the following lines are a part:—

"From these, and all long errors of the way,
In which our wandering predecessors went,
And like the old Hebrews many years did stray
In deserts but of small extent,
Bacon, like Moses, led us forth at last."

If the Baconian philosophy has still to come it has at least made a substantial beginning! When the world realises the extent of Bacon's achievement and the sacrifices he made for the sake of posterity in planning for the future and consciously and purposely casting aside the dignity of his genius and name in order to serve the welfare of humanity, when this day arrives, which surely it must, then the monument which is said to cover his proud dust in St. Michael's Church, near his Seigneurial Verulam, will become a shrine far transcending that at Trinity Church in Stratford-on-Avon.

But Bacon, who, like Moses of old, set out to lead men to the promised land of command over Nature by means of his *New Method*, even to-day lacks an interpreter, one sufficiently qualified for the prodigious task of co-ordinating his system and ascending the *Ladder of the Intellect* to the Pisgah height of discovery, whence all Nature's laws are to be descried.

To the many the claims made on his behalf are but as sounding brass and tinkling cymbals, but this surely is because of the lack of that faith and that love of his fellows which makes all things possible to the happy possessor: "to that imitation we are called."

Spedding writes of Bacon's unfinished system, "of this philosophy we can make nothing. If we have not tried it, it is because we feel confident that it would not answer."

It may be that future ages will unravel the tangled web that conceals the true implications of Bacon's *New Method* and that on some far-off golden morning Bacon's vision will become a reality, when the glittering plain of man's scientific opportunity will be revealed to the world; till then "these things must continue as they have been: but so will that also continue whereupon learning hath ever relied, and which faileth not:—

"'JUSTIFICATA EST SAPIENTIA À FILIIS SUIS.'"

[1] The Royal Society, 1660-1940. Sir Henry Lyons, F.R.S., Cambridge University Press, 1944.

SHAKESPEARE'S DELINEATION OF THE PASSION OF ANGER.

(*Reprinted from* BACONIANA, *January*, 1910).

IT seems to have been the intention of Bacon to divide his philosophy into two great branches—Natural Philosophy, or Science—and Moral Philosophy, or the science of human passions and dispositions. He early and repeatedly asserts that the mirror of the human mind must first be cleansed from its layer of ignorance, superstitions, prejudice and passions before it can truly reflect the rays of the truth of nature. There must be a marriage, he says, between nature and the mind of man. His philosophy was a new thing in the world, but, as he writes to the King, it was "but copied from a very ancient pattern, no other than the world itself, and the nature itself, and of the mind." That he intended to anatomize human passions seems clear, for he explicitly says:

"For we form a history and tables of invention for *anger*, fear, shame, *and the like*, and also for *examples in civil life*."

Novum Organum I, 127.

This branch of philosophy he describes in other words as "that knowledge which considereth of the Appetite and Will of Man," and that must be studied, inquired of, and illustrated by examples, as he further says:

"Another article of this knowledge is the inquiry touching the *affections*, for as in medicining of the body, it is in order first to know the divers complexions and constitutions; secondly, the diseases; and lastly, the cures: so in *medicining* the mind, after knowledge of the divers characters of men's *natures* it followeth, in order, to know the diseases and infirmities of the mind, which are no other than the perturbations and distempers of the affections."

Now, it is peculiar that we look in vain for an open handling of this subject by Bacon in the manner he suggested, and further, that that work has already been accomplished by poets and historians. He continues thus:

"But the *poets* and writers of histories are the best *doctors* of *this knowledge*; where we *may find* painted forth with great life, how affections are *kindled* and *incited*; and how *pacified* and *restrained*; and how again *contained from act* and further degree; how they *disclose themselves*; how they *work*; how they gather and fortify; how they are enwrapped one within another; how they do fight and encounter one with another; and other the like particularities; amongst the which this last is of special use in moral and civil matters; how, I say, to set affection against affection, and to master one by another; even as we used to hunt beast with beast, and fly bird with bird, which otherwise perhaps we could not so easily recover; upon which foundation is erected that excellent use of 'praemium' and 'poena' whereby civil states consist; employing the predominant affections of fear and hope, for the suppressing and bridling the rest. For as in the government of states it is sometimes necessary to bridle one affection with another, so it is in the government within."

But by the unanimous verdict of the literary world it is Shake-

speare who is the great doctor paramount of this knowledge—the mighty master of human nature, whose art parallels at every point Bacon's own philosophy; and in the above extract we are brought to a realisation that Bacon, beyond any subsequent critic, has furnished the most perfect description of the principles of the Shake-speare art. Milton alone, in the following lines, seems to have had something of the same discernment of the art, character, and purposes, of Shakespeare:

> "While the plebean imp from lofty throne,
> Creates and rules a world, and works upon
> Mankind by secret engines; now to move
> A chilling pity, then a rigorous love;
> To strike up and stroke down both joy and ire,
> To *steer the affections*; and by heavenly fire
> Mould us anew, stolen from ourselves:—
> This,—and much more which cannot be expressed
> But by himself, his tongue, and his own breast,—
> Was Shakespeare's freehold."

Who taught the Stratford peasant such a sophisticated art? Who conferred upon him the degree of Doctor of Moral Philosophy? These are no "native wood-notes wild." This is no Burns singing about mice and flowers and things, in country fields. Here is a great world-wide philosopher and teacher. Who taught Shakspere to repudiate the authority of Socrates and Plato, and re-unite Philosophy with Poetry?

Bacon treats in short essays of five human passions—Ambition, Revenge, Envy, Love, and *Anger*. Why does Shakespeare step in and furnish the "civil examples" of these passions which Bacon seems to have forgotten to supply? If the Shakespeare Plays constitute Bacon's Moral Philosophy presented to mankind by insinuation and entertainment (as Bacon says it should be taught) then we may safely ground the proposition that wherever Bacon in his admitted writings has laid down the principles of action of any certain passion, then those principles would be followed in the Shake-speare delineation of such passion. Here would be a fair test of the identity of Shakespeare and Bacon. Has Shake-speare supplied us with such a test in any delineation of the subject of Anger? Let us see.

I apprehend that the one place in the Shakespeare Plays where we may find anger clearly delineated is in the famous quarrel scene between Brutus and Cassius. What, then, are the Baconian principles by which we may cast in advance Shakespeare's treatment of that subject? Bacon first treats of the "*causes and motives*" of anger, and says they are chiefly three, of which the first, we are told, is to be "*too sensible to hurt*." In the great quarrel scene Cassius is the one who is indignant over some supposed affront upon the part of Brutus. The latter, from the description by Lucilius of his reception by Cassius, looked upon his brother general as a "hot friend cooling." Brutus seems to have had no inkling that Cassius was holding against him a grudge for some wrong done the latter by Brutus, but when they

first meet Cassius is quick with his grievance. He speaks first, and without even any interchange of greetings, abruptly says:

"Most noble Brother, you have done me wrong."

Brutus denies that he would wrong even an enemy, and asks how he could wrong a brother. When they have retired to Brutus' tent so that their conversation may not be overheard by the common soldiers, Cassius, like Bacon, deals *first* with the "*cause and motive*" of his anger, which appears at once to be nothing that Brutus has done to him personally, but is his refusal of Cassius' request to let off from punishment for bribery, one Lucius Pella. Cassius says:

"That you have wronged me doth appear in this:
You have condemned and noted Lucius Pella
For taking bribes here from the Sardians:
Wherein my letters, *praying on his side*,
Because I knew the man, was slighted off."

It thus clearly appears from Cassius' own statement that he was wrong in charging injury to him by Brutus, his superior officer. Brutus had the clear right to refuse to interfere in the punishment of Pella even against Cassius' request, and by a coincidence it also appears that the "*cause and motive*" of Cassius' grievance was the first mentioned by Bacon. He was "*too sensible of hurt*."

The second natural disposition tending to anger is given by Bacon as "*the apprehension and construction of the injury offered, to be, in the circumstances thereof, full of contempt.*" This was, really, the thing that stung Cassius. His apprehension and construction of Brutus' action in condemning and noting Lucius Pella in spite of his (Cassius') protest was, that Brutus was treating him (Cassius) with contempt. Cassius was humiliated in his pride and self-esteem. He was one of those "tender and delicate persons" who, Bacon says, must "needs be often angry." It was a woman's trait, and Cassius says he inherited it from his mother.

The third cause and motive of anger, Bacon continues, is "opinion of the *touch of a man's reputation*," which, he says, doth "*multiply and sharpen* anger." And again Shakespeare follows Bacon to the letter, for after Cassius has disclosed the cause of his grievance, Brutus justly retorts:

"You wronged yourself to write in such a case."

Cassius responds:

"In such a time as this, it is not meet
That every nice offence should bear his comment,"

meaning that every trifling offence should not be subject to severe punishment. And then the lash of Brutus' whip strikes that very tender spot of *Cassius' own reputation*, and on the very subject of bribery. Brutus says:

"Let me tell you, Cassius, you yourself
Are much condemned to have an *itching palm*;
To sell and mart your offices for gold
To undeservers."

Here was the exact "touch of reputation" that made Cassius' anger "multiply and sharpen." Watch him burst into flame. See his colour come and go; observe him stamp and tremble, swell, and bend his fist—signs a good actor would evince should he follow Bacon's directions as given by him in Century VIII. of his Natural History. Hear Cassius rage:

I an itching palm?
You know that you are Brutus that speak this,
Or by the gods this speech were else your last."

But Brutus is warming with indignation himself, yet with a different and nobler sort of anger. Again he talks straight out and cuts Cassius to the quick:—

"The name of Cassius honours this corruption,
And chastisement does therefore hide his head."

What! Chastisement for him, Cassius, the proud peer of any Roman! No wonder he repeats in rage the sole word—

"Chastisement!"

Then Cassius *does* begin to feel something in the line of a real instead of an imaginary contempt, that could end only in a killing for Brutus or complete subjection for Cassius. Hear the splendid lesson, the noble scorn and contempt for grafters, which Brutus hurls at him:—

'Remember March, the ides of March remember,
Did not great Julius bleed for justice sake?
What villain touched his body, that did stab,
And not for justice? What! Shall one of us
That struck the foremost man of all the world,
But for supporting robbers, shall we now
Contaminate our fingers with base bribes,
And sell the mighty space of our large honours
For so much trash as may be grasped thus?"

Then the terrific scorn and contempt in the closing two lines:—

"I'd rather be a dog and bay the moon
Than such a Roman."

Cassius' soul wavers under the fearful rebuke, and in his reply he shows a slight tendency to shift his ground:—

"Brutus bay not me,
I'll not endure it; you forget yourself,
To hedge me in. I am a soldier, I,
Older in practice, abler than yourself
To make conditions."

But Brutus is not through with this wonderful Baconian example of an angry man, and he cuts Cassius again with that most contemptuous expression—

"*Go to*: you are not, Cassius."

Cassius again blusters, but Brutus lays contempt upon contempt in the expression—

"Away, slight man!"

And probably with "eyes *staringly wild*, face troubled, voice frightful, mouth foaming, startling and quaking, raging and tuffling" (Additional signs of anger described by Montaigne in *his* essay "On Anger") Cassius can only articulate—

"Is't possible?"

But none of these signs can affright the "noblest Roman of them all." He is going to the end in this quarrel, and his own anger glows like a living coal:—

> "Hear me, for I will speak.
> Must I give way and room to your rash choler?
> Shall I be frighted when a *madman stares*?"

This marks the climax of Cassius' passion, although his exclamation contains a hint that he realises his defeat. In a wild frenzy he exclaims—

> "O ye gods! ye gods! Must I endure all this?"

Then Brutus rides rough-shod over Cassius' proud spirit and tramples it into the earth:—

> "All this? ay more. Fret, till your proud heart break.
> Go, show your *slaves* how choleric you are,
> And make your *bond-men* tremble. Must I budge?
> Must I observe you? Must I stand and crouch
> Under your testy humour? By the gods,
> You shall digest the venom of your spleen,
> Though it do split you; for from this day forth,
> I'll use you for my mirth, yea, for my laughter,
> When you are waspish."

The remainder of the scene is what Bacon calls the "allaying and calming" of Cassius' anger. Cassius has been "appeased," and according to the Baconian rule, which is, as to the contempt, "imputing it to misunderstanding, fear, passion or what you will." Here Cassius' anger is appeased by Brutus acknowledging that he himself spoke in passion, and agreeing that Cassius' anger was caused by a natural defect of temper:—

Cas.—"Have you not love enough to bear with me,
When that *rash humour*, which *my mother gave me*,
Makes me forgetful?"

Bru.—"Yes, Cassius; and from henceforth,
When you are over earnest with your Brutus,
He'll think your mother chides, and leaves you so."

It will be further noted in this scene that although Cassius' anger is wrought up to the highest pitch, it results in no mischief—no actual clash of arms between them. Brutus drives steadily forward until the subject of their controversy is exhausted. He presses the charge against Cassius of refusing to send money to assist in paying Brutus' legions, which Cassius first denies and then admits. There is no "breaking off" in their discussion, which, if it had happened, might have resulted in the armies of the respective generals flying at each other's throats. The Baconian rule again applies, for Bacon says:—

> "To contain anger from mischief, though it take hold of a man, there be two things whereof you must have special caution . . . the other, that you do not peremptorily break off in any business in a fit of anger."

Brutus knew his Bacon better than some modern Shakespeareans!

It requires no very close analysis of this great quarrel to realize that Shakespeare is presenting us with two radically different forms or

characters of anger as displayed by the participants. The anger of Cassius is like that of a screaming, passionate child, breaking out upon slight cause, but, after proper chastisement, returning humbly for reconciliation and forgiveness. His anger is childish and full of the woman. Brutus calls it a "*testy* humour." It is wild and ungoverned, and Cassius loses himself in his frenzy. There is nothing noble or virtuous about it, but it appears ignoble and base throughout. It nowhere has our sympathy. It is founded upon a defence of bribery and corruption, and is full of evasions, shiftings and excuses. With Brutus it is different. He takes fire slowly, but he burns hotter and hotter, yet does not lose his head for an instant. It is filled with virtuous indignation towards corrupt and oppressive practices and the dishonouring of the name of a Roman citizen. And in this respect we meet again at every point the Baconian elements, analyses, and directions. Bacon says:—

"Anger is certainly a kind of *baseness*; as it appears well in the weakness of those subjects in whom it reigns, *children*, *women*, old folks, sick folks."

Yet there is a way in which this appearance of baseness may be removed. The essay continues:—

"Only men must beware that they carry their anger rather *with scorn* than with fear; so that they may seem rather to be *above the injury* than below it; which is a thing easily done if a man will *give law to* himself in it."

Brutus knows the precepts. He gives *the law* to himself; he governs himself—in his anger. And with what splendid magnanimity and scorn he carries himself! With what fine moral courage he stands against Cassius and his threats! How he rises above and effaces that element of baseness which might otherwise appear in his own anger. Hear him:

> There is no terror, Cassius, in your threats,
> For I am armed so strong in honesty,
> That they pass by me as the *idle wind*,
> Which I *respect not*. I did send to you
> For certain sums of gold, which you denied me;
> For I can raise no money by vile means;
> By heaven, I had rather coin my heart,
> And drop my blood for drachmas, than to wring
> From the hard hands of peasants their vile trash,
> By any indirection. I did send
> To you for gold to pay my legions,
> Which you denied me: was that done like Cassius?"

And mark the peroration of that same "scorn" and fearlessness:

> "When Marcus Brutus grows so covetous
> To lock such rascal counters from his friends,
> Be ready gods, with all your thunderbolts,
> Dash him to pieces!"

No wonder that Cassius wobbled on his feet, lied and denied, and whined for sympathy with his "infirmities"!

What does it all mean? Here is Shakespeare, the great moral philosopher, delineating a human passion, patiently, step by step, illustrating with minutest detail the analyses, elements, rules and

directions of Bacon upon the same subject. And we are asked to believe that this is all blind coincidence—something a thousand times harder to do than believe that it is Bacon himself, the concealed poet, re-joining the anciently severed union of Philosophy and Poetry.

The first edition of Bacon's Essays published in 1597, and dedicated to his brother Anthony, *did not contain the essay "On Anger."* The next edition in 1606, which did not purport to be issued by Bacon, was only a transcript of the original 1597 edition. The next edition was issued in 1612, and under Bacon's authority. It purports to contain 40 essays, but two of them, "Of the Republic" and "Of Warre and Peace," were omitted from the body of the work. And the essay "On Anger" *was not among them.* In the next edition of 1613 still the essay "On Anger "is missing. Following this came the edition of 1625 — only a few months before Bacon died—and where at last this particular essay shows its head. *When was this essay written? or why did Bacon keep it so long by him before its publication?* These facts are equally true regarding the essay "On Envy," the delineation of which passion Mr. Dixon has ably shown also to have been followed by Shakespeare along the same close Baconian lines in this same play of *Julius Caesar. Why were these two particular essays upon two human passions, both delineated in the same play, kept back from publication until the appearance of Julius Caesar for the first time in the Shakespeare Folio of* 1623?

When was the play *Julius Caesar* written? Nobody knows, but there are several guesses—one, that it was written before 1603; another, before the play of *Hamlet*. About 1609 Bacon wrote to Toby Matthew, sending him a copy of his memorial of Queen Elizabeth, and in his letter says:

"Of this, when you were here, I showed you some model, though at that time methought you were as willing to *hear Julius Caesar* as Queen Elizabeth, commended."

This letter discloses that prior to 1609 Matthew had been in London and had, to Bacon's knowledge, "heard *Julius Caesar* commended." But commended by whom? Where? Under what circumstances? It was evidently no casual or trifling incident to be thus remembered and referred to by Bacon. Did Toby, the Catholic, and Bacon see the play together at the theatre? Hardly. Was it the manuscript of the play still in Bacon's possession which he showed Matthew, and which Toby must have highly enjoyed? Toby had once returned to Bacon *Measure for Measure*—strangely enough the name of another Shakespeare play. All of the mutilated correspondence we possess shows that no one was closer to Bacon in literary matters than Matthew, himself a man of fine learning and literary discrimination, and who certainly acted as Bacon's agent on the continent in literary and other matters. Should the reference be to the play of *Julius Caesar*, then that play must have been written some time prior to the year 1609. Upon the Baconian theory, all these thousand puzzles and problems, mists and clouds, are solved and dispelled. Without it we are lost in a fog that never lifts.

F. C. HUNT.

MONTAIGNE'S ESSAYS

Part II.

By Edward D. Johnson.

IN the first part of this article, which appeared in the July number of Baconiana, I drew the reader's attention to the fact that the rosette on the pillar on the left hand side of the gateway has 6 petals and that the rosette on the opposite Pillar has 7 petals, and that there are 3 circles at the top of half of the pillar on the left hand side up against the margin and 3 circles at the top of half of the pillar shown on the right-hand side—leaving the reader to make his own deductions from this. The numbers 6 and 7 placed together give 67, and 67 is the simple count of the word Francis (i and j being the same letter and also u and v, as in Elizabethan times the English alphabet consisted of 24 letters only)—thus

6	17	1	13	3	9	18 = 67.
F	R	A	N	C	I	S

The numbers 3 and 3 placed together give 33, and 33 is the simple count of Bacon—thus:

2	1	3	14	13 = 33.
B	A	C	O	N

This, of course, might be a coincidence—on the other hand, the reader has been distinctly told to spell the picture.

If the reader will look at the verses opposite the picture he will see that the 23rd line down is

Concealed Fruits to light: Ev'n thus did we

and that the 23rd line up is

In such abundance, that they prove to bee

and that the centre of the verses is between these two lines. Here are these two lines with the two lines above and below them:—

I	N	No shewes or promises, of such choice things
B	A	A diligent unfolder of them brings
A	C	*Concealed* fruits to light: Ev'n thus did we
C	I	In such abundance, that they *prove to bee*
O	B	Beyond a briefe expression, and have stop't
N	O	Our purpose in preserving what we hop'd.

The marginal letters rearranged give I BACON; the last words on the fourth line are "Prove to bee," and the first word on the third line is "concealed"—thus: "I BACON prove to be concealed."

Here would appear to be a signature worked into the margin of the very enigmatical verses addressed to the Beholder of this Title—very similar to those in the margin of the various verses and addresses in the First Folio of The Shakespeare Plays.

At the bottom of the engraved Title Page are the words "MARTIN DR. SCULPSIT."

The words "MARTIN DROESHOUT SCULPSIT" appear underneath the Dummy Mask portrait in the First Folio of the Shakespeare Plays published in 1623. The title page of this Edition of Montaigne's Essays must have been engraved by him according to instructions received from whoever published this book.

Why should Montaigne say that "he feared to glut the world with his works" when nothing is claimed for him but one volume of essays? Bacon also says that he feared to glut the world with his writings.*

Montaigne seems to have been rather a mysterious individual. I have consulted the following books: "Michel de Montaigne," by Professor Edward Dowden, 1905; "Michel de Montaigne," by E. Sichel, and "Montaigne," by F. C. Wallis, 1927, but none of these books really tell us much about him. We are told that Michel Eyquem, who afterwards called himself Montaigne, was born at his father's chateau at Montaigne in Perigord in 1533, that he went into the law, but, inheriting the family estates in 1571, retired to Montaigne, and that he died in 1592, aged 59. He is supposed to have written the Essays between 1571 and 1580, as the First French Edition was published at Bordeaux in 1580. In 1603, *eleven years after his death*, the First English Edition was published in London, the translater being stated to be John Florio. This Edition contains many additions and alterations, such as Montaigne himself could not have made, as he had died eleven years before it was published. The writers of the three books before mentioned seem to derive all the small amount of information given from the Essays themselves. They give no record that Montaigne had any literary friends, and he apparently lived in seclusion at Montaigne.

It would appear that "Shakespeare" was considerably influenced by Montaigne, as is clearly demonstrated in a book entitled "Shakespeare's Debt to Montaigne," by George Coffin Taylor, 1925. Mr. Taylor writes: "Citations from Florio's Montaigne are so numerous and so definitely similar, in both thought and phrase, to passages in Shakespeare's plays that the conclusion will be inescapable that Shakespeare was very extensively affected by the Essays of Montaigne." He states that there are 750 words in Florio's Montaigne *which were never used by anyone else except Shakespeare and Montaigne prior to* 1603. Many of these words found only in Shake-

*See:—". . the Verulam sage was filled with the desire of writing and enriched the ages with crowds of books. . ." and,

". . You have filled the world with your writings and the ages with your fame." MANES VERULAMIANI.—ED.

speare and Montaigne are exceedingly rare. Take, for instance, the word "marble-hearted," which appears only in Shakespeare and Montaigne. It is clear that many of those words were freshly coined either by "Shakespeare" or "Montaigne," and they are not listed in the Oxford Dictionary as entering the English language at all as early as 1603. There are a large number of similar passages in Shakespeare and Montaigne, which point clearly to the conclusion that in almost every instance Shakespeare, before arriving at his destination, had made a detour through the forest of Montaigne, and they justify the inference that Shakespeare had read Florio's Montaigne practically from cover to cover. Mr. Taylor states that in Hamlet there are 51 passages taken from Montaigne, in King Lear 23, in Troillus and Cressida 16, in Macbeth 11, in Measure for Measure 10, in The Tempest 8, in Anthony and Cleopatra 7, in The Winter's Tale 5, in Alls Well that Ends Well 4, in Timon of Athens 4, in Othello 4, in Cymbeline 3, in Coriolanus 3, and in Henry VIII 1. It will be observed that there are more passages from Montaigne in Hamlet than in any of the other plays. The play of Hamlet was published before the first English Translation of Montaigne in 1603, so it follows that "Shakespeare" must have read Montaigne in the original French. There is no record that Will Shaksper of Stratford could read French. French was not taught at the Stratford Grammar School (even if Shaksper was ever a pupil there, of which there is no evidence), and there is nothing to show that Shaksper learnt to read French after he arrived in London in 1587 or shortly afterwards.

MALVOLIO'S LETTER.

In *Twelfth Night*, Act II, sc. 5, is the well-known scene in which Malvolio reads a letter prepared, to deceive him, by Maria. The letter contains the phrase, "M.O.A.I. doth sway my life," upon which Malvolio comments, "What should that alphabetical position portend? . . . If I could make that resemble something in me."

As a solution of this little mystery I would suggest that the clue is in the word "sway." Take the name Malvolio: "M, that begins my name," says the steward. Remove the letter M, then sway to the end of the name and remove the letter O, sway back and remove the A, sway forward again and remove the I. The "something in me" which is left is L.V.O.L., and these letters represent the numbers 11, 20, 14, 11, equal to 56; this is Fr. Bacon, in simple cipher.

SOME EXAMPLES OF SHAKESPEARE'S USE OF THE EMBLEM BOOKS.

By EDWARD D. JOHNSON.

A perusal of the work of the Emblem writers seems to show that "Shakespeare" was indebted to them for a number of ideas and suggestions which he incorporated in the text of the Plays, and in making his translations and adoptions from the original authors, either Latin, Greek, French, or Italian, he often amplified and improved the original work. From the emblem writers he appears to have derived many of the mythological allusions and expressions which are found in the Plays.

Mr. Lewis Biddulph, in his very able article entitled "Was Francis Bacon connected with the emblem literature of the 16th and 17th centuries?" which appeared in the April and July, 1942, issues of BACONIANA, clearly demonstrated that Francis Bacon had employed the emblem books very widely, and it is hoped that the following examples will help the reader to understand how he did so.

IN *Henry V*, Act 3, Scene 7, the Dauphin, praising his horse Pegasus, says "He bounds from the earth, he trots the air." In Reusner, 1581, is a picture of a horse exactly like the one the dauphin praises—it has a warrior on its back and bounds along, trotting in the air.

In *King Lear*, Act 2, Scene 4, the Fool says, "We'll set thee to school to an ant to teach thee there's no labouring in the winter."

In Freitag, 1579, is a picture of a ne'er-do-well grasshopper and a sage schoolmaster of an ant with verses about the wise ants who during the summer had stored up food for their use in the winter—the grasshopper having neglected to do so, being starved. There is a Latin proverb (Prov. xx, 4) placed under the picture. The Sluggard will not plow by reason of the cold, therefore shall he beg in harvest, and have nothing." In Whitney, 1586, is a similar picture of a grasshopper and ants with a Latin sentence at the top meaning "While the spring of life is passing, consult for winter."

The words in *King Lear* seem to show that "Shakespeare" was familiar with one or both of the emblem pictures in Freitag and Whitney.

In Coornhert, 1585, is a picture of a poor man and a rich man with two hands appearing from the clouds and handing to the poor man a bag of gold and to the rich man an empty bowl.

In *The Tempest*, Act 3, Scene 2, we read:

"And then, in dreaming,
The clouds methought would open, and shew riches
Ready to drop on me."

The title of Coomhert's picture is "The right use and misuse of worldly wealth."

In *Henry IV*, part 2, Act 4, Scene 4, the King, speaking of Fortune, says:

She either gives a stomach, and no food,
Such are the poor in health; or else a feast
And takes away the stomach; such are the rich,
That have abundance and enjoy it not."

In Constau, 1560, is a picture of Orpheus charming animals by playing the harp, with the words:

"With sound gentle and very melodious
Of an instrument Orpheus caused to move
Rocks and pastures from their place and home."

In *The Merchant of Venice*, Act 5, Scene 1, Lorenzo speaking of a herd of wild colts says:

"If they but hear perchance a trumpet sound
Or any air of music touch their ears,
You shall perceive them make a mutual stand,
Their savage eyes turn'd to a modest gaze
By the sweet power of music: therefore the Poet
Did feign that Orpheus drew trees, stones and floods:"

In *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, Act 3, Scene 2, Proteus says:

"For Orpheus' lute was strung with poets' sinews
Whose golden touch could soften steel and stones."

In *Henry VIII*, Act 3, Scene 1, there is a song the first two lines of which are:

"Orpheus with his lute made trees
And the mountain tops that freeze
Bow themselves when he did sing."

In Alciat 1551, is a picture of the goddess Opportunity standing on a wheel floating on the waves. A very similar picture is found on page 181, of Whitney, where there is a flowing tide and ships making for the shore. Underneath Whitney's picture are three verses, the last one containing the words:

"That I may warne all people to not staye
But at the first occasion to imbrace.
And when she comes, to meete her by the waye."

We find almost exactly the same thought in *Julius Caesar*, Act 4, Scene 3, expressed in the words:

"There is a tide in the affairs of men,
Which taken at the flood leads on to fortune."

To be continued).

THE TEMPEST

By Edward D. Johnson.

"THE TEMPEST" was the last play written by Francis Bacon, but he places it first in the First Folio, as he considered it to be the most important of all his plays. As it had never been published before the issue of the First Folio, Francis Bacon took the opportunity of manipulating the text so as to show his signature a number of times. The numerical seal or count of the word BACON is 33, as follows:—

2	1	3	14	13	=	33
B	A	C	O	N		

and it will be shown how Francis Bacon used this number 33 as a means of informing his readers that he was the author. The *first* letter on the *first* line of "The Tempest" is a large ornamental B. If we count 33 *lines down* from this B it takes us to the following line:

OWNE DOTH LITTLE ADVANTAGE IF HE BE NOT BORNE TO BEE.

The following shows this line with the two lines above and below it:

HE *HE* HATH NO DROWNING MARKE UPON HIM, HIS COMPLEXION

IS *IS* PERFECT GALLOWES: STAND FAST GOOD FATE TO HIS HAN-

HOG GING, MAKE THE ROPE OF HIS DESTINY OUR CABLE, FOR OUR

*O*WNE DOTH LITTLE ADVANTAGE: IF HE BE NOT BORNE TO BEE

HANG'D *HA*NG'D, OUR CASE IS MISERABLE.

It will be seen that in the margin of these five lines we get

HE
IS
G
O
HANG'D

Also we see in the second of these five lines the word GALLOWES, which gives us

GALLOWES HE IS HANGED HOG.
A HOG WHICH IS HANGED OF COURSE BECOMES BACON.

We thus find the word GALLOWES in the text and the author's name *hanging* in the margin.

With reference to the word HANGING—part of which is at the end of the 2nd line and part at the beginning of the 3rd line—if an Author has to split this word he would do so thus HANG-ING, not HAN-GING, but Francis Bacon required a G as the first letter on the 3rd of these lines, which accounts for the fact that HANGING appears as HAN-GING instead of HANG-ING.

If we count 33 lines *up* from the *last* line of the 2nd column on this first page in "The Tempest" we see that the 1*st* word on this 33*rd* line is *HANG*, and if we count 33 lines down this 2nd column we see that the first letter on this 33*rd* line is F.

As already mentioned, the *first* letter on the *first* line of "The Tempest" is B.

Placing these results together we get

F B HE IS HANG'D HOG HANG

If we turn to the end of the play we see that the *first* letter on the last line of the play is also B, the last line being as follows:

BE FREE, AND FARE THOU WELL, PLEASE YOU DRAW NEERE

The word FRANCIS means FREE, so if we reverse the first two words on this last line we see FRANCIS B.

Going to the 33rd line from the B the *first* letter on the *first* line in "The Tempest" took us to the signature "HE IS HANG'D HOG."

Now turn to the 33rd line back from the B, the *first* letter on the *last* line of "The Tempest," which we find is

THIS IS AS STRANGE A THING AS ERE I LOOK'D ON.

It certainly is the strangest method ever conceived by an author of showing his signature to this play.

We will now pass on to the first column of the 2nd page in "The Tempest." Using the same method as before we find that the 33rd line up the 1st column of this page is

BEGUN TO TELL ME, WHAT I AM BUT STOPT

This line with the two lines below it and the 8 lines above it are:

TIS	T	THE VERY VERTUE OF COMPASSION IN THEE
	I	I HAVE WITH SUCH PROVISION IN MINE ART
	S	SO SAFELY ORDERED, THAT THERE IS NO SOULE
N B	N	NO, NOT SO MUCH PERDITION AS AN HAYRE
	B	BETID TO ANY CREATURE IN THE VESSELL
W S	W S	*W*HICH THOU HEARDST CRY, WHICH THOU SAWST *S*INKE. *S*IT DOWNE
F BACON	F	FOR THOU MUST NOW KNOW FARTHER. YOU HAVE OFTEN
	B	BEGUN TO TELL ME WHAT I AM, BUT STOPT
	A	AND LEFT ME TO A BOOTLESSE INQUISITION.
	CON	CONCLUDING, STAY: NOT YET.

In the margin we see TIS, N B (abbreviation of NOTA BENE, (Latin=NOTE WELL) F BACON

The only two capital letters in the sixth of these lines are W (William) and S (Shaksper).

Observe that the eighth of these lines has been purposely inset, so as not to interfere with the signature F BACON.

We find two signatures BACON, one being B and the other B
A AN
CON CO

Now look at the 33*rd* line up the 2nd column of this second page in "The Tempest," which is:

"To closeness and the bettering of my mind."

This line with the four following lines are:

TWO	T	TO CLOSENESS AND THE BETTERING OF MY MIND
	W	WITH THAT WHICH BUT BY BEING SO RETIRED
	O	ORE-PRIZED ALL POPULAR RATE: IN MY FALSE BROTHER
ALIKE	A	AWAK'D AN EVILL NATURE, AND MY TRUST
	LIKE	LIKE A GOOD PARENT, DID BEGET OF HIM.

Here we see in the margin TWO ALIKE, exactly opposite the two signatures F and F
B B in the first column of this page.
A AN
CON CO

Not only has the author placed two signatures in the first column of this 2nd page in "The Tempest," but he has taken the trouble to tell us that he has done so.

Now turn to the 33*rd* line up the 1st column of the 3*rd* page in "The Tempest," which will be found to be

INSTINCTIVELY HAVE QUIT IT: THERE THEY HOYST US.

The first word on this 33rd line is INSTINCTIVELY, which means prompted by instinct, so the reader's instinct will show him the author's signatures in this play as already demonstrated.

Now look at the 33*rd* line down the 2nd column of this page 3, which is

YEA, HIS DREAD TRIDENT SHAKE

A Trident is a three-pronged spear, so reading the line backwards the last two words are SHAKE SPEAR, the 1st letter on the 33*rd* line in the 1st column of the *opposite* page being B of F BACON.

We now pass on to page 4 of "The Tempest."

The 33*rd* line down the 1st column of this page 4 is

THE FOWLE WITCH SYCORAX WHO WITH AGE AND ENVY.

This line with the following six lines are

TWO
T THE FOWLE WITCH SYCORAX WHO WITH AGE AND ENVY
W WAS GROWNE INTO A HOOPE? HAST THOU FORGOT HER?
NO SIR.
THOU HAST: WHERE WAS SHE BORN? SPEAK: TELL ME:
SIR, IN ARGIER.
O, WAS SHE SO: I MUST
O ONCE IN A MONETH RECOUNT WHAT THOU HAST BIN,

Here once more we find the word TWO in the margin, the T being the 1st letter on the 33*rd* line down the column—the T of the word TWO in the 2nd column of the *2nd* page being also the 1st letter on the 33*rd* line up the column.

Observe how the 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th of these lines have been purposely inset to enable the marginal letters to spell out the word TWO.

Now look at the last of these lines, which is

ONCE IN A MONETH RE*COUNT* WHAT THOU HAST BIN.

We find in the middle of the line the letters COUNT, with exactly the same number of letters (namely 15) before COUNT as there are after it.

To get COUNT in the exact centre of this line the author has spelt month, moneth, because he wants an extra letter, and he has spelt been, bin, because he has to drop a letter so as to get 15 letters before COUNT and 15 letters after COUNT. This shows a deliberate design to draw the reader's attention to COUNT and to tell him to count the lines, which we have been doing.

We find another example of this method in the 33*rd* line up the 1st column of page 14 in this play, which is

TO MAKE THIS *CON*TRACT GROW BUT *BA*RRAINE HATE

Here we see 10 letters then CON, and counting back from the end of the line 10 letters and then *BA*. To get BA and CON in the same position in this line the author has had to spell BARREN BARRAINE so as to obtain 2 extra letters to make 10 letters after BA to agree with the 10 letters before CON.

(*To be continued.*)

SHAKESPEARE LEGENDS

By J. E. Lloyd.

THE veil of mystery which surrounds Shakespeare's youth has always led to much speculation, and many scholars have searched the archives in the hope of discovering something new.

Despite the lack of any authentic information, it has been asserted that the early days of Shakespeare were rather wild, and spent in gambling, drinking, poaching and the like.

If one bears in mind the station in which Shakespeare was born, and his general environment, "bound apprentice to a butcher," it would certainly be difficult to conceive him resting content in a country town like Stratford, and rejecting all enticements of young-blooded companions.

Although no list of students at the Grammar School about this period can be found, it is assumed that Shakespeare left rather early, but nothing is known about him until his recorded marriage to Anne Hathaway, at the age of eighteen.

There are, however, many streams of tradition in which the curious may wade, and one can become interested in the story of Shakespeare's hurried departure from Stratford, and how he first obtained employment in London by holding horses' heads until he found his vocation with the play actors.

Nearly all early traditions are agreed that Shakespeare was compelled to leave hurriedly because he was involved in trouble over poaching with Sir Thomas Lucy, the chief landowner.

This story of poaching has been the subject of much controversy and it is alleged that the exploit took place in Sir Thomas Lucy's park, and Shakespeare stole a deer for his wedding feast.

Some scholars have held that this story is nothing but a myth and arose out of the passage in the Merry Wives of Windsor, in which Justice Shallow complains that Falstaff has beaten his men and killed his deer.

It may be that this is the case, and that the deer-stalking story and all the tales of drinking are due to the inventiveness of innkeepers, but the story is first encountered over two centuries ago, in the early jottings of Richard Davies, who became Rector of Sapperton in Gloucestershire in 1695, and he records that for the offence Shakespeare was whipped and beaten.

A more detailed version is told in Rowe's "Account of the life, etc., of Mr. William Shakespeare," 1709.

According to Rowe, Shakespeare and his companions made a practise of following their favourite diversion, which they did so

often that Sir Thomas Lucy's resentment was raised and he commenced prosecution, but desisted upon their abject submission.

This hurt the high spirits of Shakespeare, and he is said to have composed the following ballad and nailed it to the gates of Charlecote Park:—

A parliament member, a justice of peace,
At home a poore scarecrowe, in London an asse,
If Lucy is Lowsie as some volke misscall it,
Synge Lowsie Lucy whatever befall it.

He thinks hymself great, yet an asse in hys state,
We allowe bye his cares but with asses to mate,
If Lucy is Lowsie as some volke misscall it,
Synge Lowsie Lucy whatever befall it.

He's haughty, proud, insolent, knight of the shire,
At home nobodye loves, yet there's many hym feare,
If Lucy is Lowsie as some volke misscall it,
Synge Lowsie Lucy whatever befall it.

To the sessions he went and dyd sorely complain
His parke had been rob'd and his deer they were slain,
This Lucy is Lowsie as some volke misscall it,
Synge Lowsie Lucy whatever befall it.

He sayd twas a ryot, his men had been beat,
His venison was stole and clandestinely eat,
Soe Lucy is Lowsie as some volke misscall it,
Synge Lowsie Lucy whatever befall it.

So haughty was he when the fact was confess'd,
He sayd 'twas a crime that could not be redress'd,
Soe Lucy is Lowsie as some volke misscall it,
Synge Lowsie Lucy whatever befall it.

Though Lucies a dozen he paints in his coat
His name it shall Lowsie for Lucy bee wrote,
For Lucy is Lowsie as some volke misscall it,
Synge Lowsie Lucy whatever befall it.

If a iuvinile frolick he cannot forgive,
We'll synge Lowsie Lucy as long as we live.
And Lucy the Lowsie a libel may call it,
We'll synge Lowsie Lucy whatever befall it.

The wrath of Sir Thomas Lucy was aroused and he renewed his prosecution with redoubled vigour, and his power was too great for

poor Shakespeare to contend with, who saw that he would have to quit his wife, family and native place immediately.

Another traditional story about Shakespeare's youth is usually referred to as "The Crabtree Legend." This story may not be as familiar as the "Deer Stalking Episode," but interests the present writer as it is woven around some doggerel verse, which links together a group of villages near Stratford-on-Avon.

The doggerel is common enough in the Midlands but may be unknown to the general reader. It runs as follows:—

Piping Pebworth, Dancing Marston,
Haunted Hilboro, Hungry Grafton,
Dodging Exhall, Papist Wixford,
Beggarly Broom, and Drunken Bidford.

There is nothing in this rough Warwickshire rhyme to suggest that it is the work of Shakespeare. Similar rhymes linking clusters of villages together can be heard in many parts of the country.

A traditional rhyme of equal age can be heard repeated in other parts of Warwickshire and as far as I am aware the following has not been ascribed to any particular poet:—

Idlicote on the Hill, Whatcote Downderry,
Beggarly Oxhill and Lousy Fulready,
Yawning Yittington, Peeping Pillarton,
And one-eyed Marston.

Nevertheless "The Crabtree Legend" must have been fairly well established when it was referred to by an anonymous letter written in 1762 "from the place of Shakespeare's Nativity," in "British Magazine or Monthly Reposity for Gentlemen and Ladies."

> "I . . . . . put up at the White Lion . . . . . My Chearful landlord . . . . . took me to the house where the poet was born and there I saw a mulberry tree of the great man's planting, a piece of which I brought away with me, to make tobacco stoppers for our vicar.
>
> From thence my landlord was so complaisant as to go with me to visit two young women, lineal descendants of our great dramatic poet: they keep a little alehouse some small distance from Stratford.
>
> On the road thither, at a place called Bidford, he shewed me in the hedge, a crab-tree, called Shakespeare's canopy, because under it our poet slept one night, for he, as well as Ben Jonson, loved a glass for the pleasure of society; and he, having heard much of the men of that village as deep drinkers and merry fellows, one day went over to Bidford to take a cup with them. He enquired of a shepherd for the Bidford drinkers, who replied they were absent: but the Bidford Sippers were at home: and I suppose, continued the sheep keeper, they will be sufficient for you; and so, indeed they were. He was forced to take up his lodging under the tree for some hours."

It is possible that the inquisitiveness of tourists to Stratford-on-Avon about this time was meeting with a natural response, and John Jordan, a self-educated wheelwright, who was born at Tiddington in 1744, was able to add further details when writing between 1770-90.

According to Jordan, when Shakespeare and his companions arrived at "the Scene of Contendtion," "to their disagreeable disappointment they found that the Bidford Topers had gone to Evesham fair," but they were told that if they had the mind to try their strength in the science of drinking, the Sippers were ready for the contest.

> "Shakespeare and his companions made a Scoff at their Opponents, but for the want of better company they agreed to the contest, and in a little time our Bard and his Companions got so intollerable intoxicated that they (were) not able to contend any longer and accordingly set out on their return to Stratford. But had not got above a half mile on the road, e'er the(y) found themselves unable to proceed any farther, and was obliged to lie down under a crabtree which is still growing by the side of the road where they took up their repose till morning, when some of the company roused the poet and entreated him to return to Bidford and renew the contest, he declined it saying, 'I have drunk with Dodging Exhall, Papist Wicksford, etc.' "

In his book, *Shakespeare's Birthplace*, Mr. J. R. Wise gives certain particulars relating to the places mentioned in the rhyme.

"Dancing Marston is Marston Sicca (Kiftsgate hundred, Gloucester shire, four miles south-west of Stratford), a long straggling village about two miles from Welford . . . . to this day celebrated for dancing. . . . . A few fields brings us to the Piping Pebworth, which still pkees up to its reputation for music . . . , rambling over more fields, we reach the old Roman Icknield Street, which will lead us across the Avon into Bidford. . . . At the Falcon (at Bidford), now turned into a poorhouse, is a room still shown as the scene of the famous festivity. Following the Stratford road for about a mile, we shall reach on the right-hand side, the place where the crabtree stood. Broom is called beggarly from the poverty of its soil and its inhabitants, and Papist Wixford still, I believe, belongs to the old Roman Catholic family of the Throckmortons. Haunted Hillboro is now a mere farmhouse by the river side, quite lonely enough to have the credit for being haunted. Dodging Exhall is, I suppose, so-called on account of the trouble there is to find it. The prettiest place of them all is Hungry Grafton, or Temple Grafton, as it is called, where some of the old Knights of Templar once lived. But where their dwelling was there is nothing now but a farmhouse, standing very prettily amongst its elms. The epithet "Hungry" is still true of the soil, which is very "poor."

The crab-tree under which Shakespeare is said to have spent the night was demolished on the 4th December, 1824, but a section of it is still in existence, together with a section of the mulberry tree.

A SITTING ON AGATE

By R. L EAGLE.

COLLABORATION?

On July 10th, Mr. James Agate, dramatic critic of *The Sunday Times*, opened the Sixth Form Conference of the Schools of King Edward's Foundation at Birmingham. Questions were put to Mr. Agate by the students of both sexes concerning the Drama, and in *The Sunday Times* of July 22nd, twelve of these, with the replies, were given.

One of the questions was "Did Shakespeare or Bacon write the plays?"

The answer given was "*Both*. In collaboration."

Mr. Agate did not, apparently, say what was the nature of such supposed collaboration. Presumably, the idea is that Bacon supplied the outline of the story from Holinshed, Hall, Plutarch, Plautus, Boccaccio, Bandello, Cinthio and others, also the purposes and passions of the plays to be written—such as jealousy, fidelity, ambition, pride; or whether it was to be "history made visible."

The philosophy and learning are also, we suppose, to be credited to Bacon, since it is all to be found in his acknowledged writings. We seem to be left with the characters to be represented, and the prose and verse they speak or sing. But how does Mr. Agate divide the invention and composition between the two? Did the two men sit side by side discussing each entrance and exit; each character, thought and event, and the words they utter? Or was the player merely the scrivener from Bacon's dictation? There were plenty of scriveners available who wrote with "the sweet Roman hand", and Bacon would not employ a man whose laboured pen could not even make his signature legible.

There is scarcely a speech which does not reflect some Baconian thought, classicism, legal allusion, or special knowledge of some kind. Over two hundred years of patient investigation have failed to yield any evidence of tutor, studies, library, personal friendships or experiences, which would have qualified the player for the writing of any of the plays or poems. There are, however, a few scraps of dialogue which are difficult to reconcile with "the master-mind." The sublime and the trivial sometimes alternate with devastating suddenness, as in *Timon of Athens* and *Pericles*. The general opinion is that somebody in the theatre altered the script, or added "gags." This could easily be done if the author was unknown, or wished to remain concealed. Complete plays were published under the name of "William Shakespeare," which he certainly did not write, and which are quite unworthy of the label. If, however, a comedian inserts "gags" in a play, or even arranges with an author to add a piece of dialogue, can he be said to have "collaborated?" Henslowe's Diary shows that authors who wrote jointly were men of similar social and intellectual levels, such as Drayton, Dekker, Munday and Porter. There is no parallel with the "man and superman" collaboration as stated by Mr. Agate. The more one considers it, the more involved and hopeless it becomes.

MACAULAY'S LIBELS.

Macaulay's Essays were written in a style so dazzling, so impressive in appeal to the imagination, and so easy to retain in the memory, that his historical inaccuracies—particularly his libels and slanders of great men—have been frequently repeated as if they were facts, and have influenced opinion ever since. As wit, poet, orator and politician he was an outstanding figure in the first half of the nineteenth century. Nevertheless, he had neither morality nor scruples with regard to truth. He abused his political opponents, and he dipped his pen in poison when writing about several great men of the past. He seemed to take a fiendish delight in it. Even up to the present time, his misrepresentation of Bacon's character influences lesser informed writers such as journalists and "popular" biographers who, having made little, if any, personal investigation, base their statements on the slanders contained in those Essays.

Professor A. L. Rowse, in *The English Spirit* (Macmillan, 1944), has a chapter on Macaulay's Essays. We are glad to notice that he exposes Macaulay's "vivid historical imagination." These remarks are well worth recording:

> "Few works have been so severely criticised, or shown to have more serious errors."
>
> "The pity is that Macaulay had such power, such unique vividness that, when he was wrong, as he often was, he has impressed his own version upon the English mind more firmly than the truth."
>
> "His misrepresentation of Warren Hastings was responsible for the Indian attitude towards the history of our rule in India."
>
> "Most people must still be under the impression that Marlborough, though a great man, was a bad hat. That is the view that Macaulay has fixed upon us. It is quite untrue that he was a bad man. . . . The Prime Minister's life of his ancestor has disproved Macaulay once and for all."

In *The Dictionary of National Biography*, Macaulay's virtues and faults are fairly contrasted. He emerges as a strange mixture of man and writer. The contributor points out that "he never rose above the party view of politics, and explained all opposition to whig principles by the folly and knavery of their opponents." How true it is that "he often constructed pictures from trifling hints, and a picture once constructed became a settled fact. Closer examination often shows a singular audacity in outrunning tangible evidence!"

We agree, too, that he was "too much in love with the picturesque to lower his colouring to the reality. The same desire for effect *at any cost* makes some of his characters, such as Bacon, mere heaps of contradictory qualities."

With regard to his attack on Marlborough, the D.N.B. says, "The pictures which he has drawn have rightly or wrongly stamped themselves ineffaceably upon the popular mind." That was, of course, written before Mr. Churchill's reversal of Macaulay's false

judgment of the great general who covered his nation with glory by his successful campaigns, especially those leading up to the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713.

William Penn was another of Macaulay's victims. It was merely the favour he enjoyed under James II which rendered him an object of suspicion in the reign of William, but no treasonable act could ever be proved against him.

James Spedding, in *Evenings with a Reviewer* (1881), triumphantly vindicated Bacon of the base motives imputed to him by Macaulay. It will be seen, therefore, that the reputations preyed upon by this literary vulture emerge without blemish. The badge of infamy is placed solely on him.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor, BACONIANA.

Sir,

In the Editorial Notes on Mr. Eagle's article in the June BACONIANA, on the "Title page of the Arcadia" (and I note I gave "comfort to the opposition" in describing the Title page of the French Arcadia) is the following: "Perhaps it will be said that printers used to borrow engraved titles (as well as blocks) which they thought elegant or ornamental and prefixed them indiscriminately to any work they had in mind, without regard to their suitability to the subject matter of the book. Can such a theory be tenable? I do not think so."

A number of years ago this same question was brought up in reference to the "Arrow heading" found in the Shakespeare Folio, the King James Bible and several other works, and at that time a leading Publisher was consulted and we were told that all such designs on Title Pages were selected by the author, were his property and were always returned to him. The Printer, thus, would never ave them to use "indiscriminately." Whether this applied to books published in the fifteenth century I do not know.

Some enthusiasts studying the Arcadia and Spencer Title Pages have seen in the two little birds on either side of the vignette, with the Boar, a likeness to Cuckoos, who lay their eggs in other birds' nests, signifying Elizabeth giving her son to Lady Anne Bacon to rear, and find a very distinct "F.B." in the scroll work.

KATE H. PRESCOTT.

To the Editor, BACONIANA.

"ONLY AN ACTOR COULD HAVE WRITTEN THE PLAYS."

Sir,

Since the earliest days of the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy, we have often been told by the orthodox that "only an actor could have written the plays." In support of this strange contention, familiar passages have been quoted in which metaphor, simile and allusion are drawn upon and illustrated from the theatre and its craft. These references are neither significant nor important, and are too rare to support the actor-author tradition. Some even disparage players as ranters and roarers, lacking intelligence and discretion. Hamlet's advice to the players is the trump card of the Stratfordian in this argument. Yet it merely consists of a few obvious points to be observed in speech, elocution and gesture, all equally important as the equipment of a public *speaker*. As an orator, Bacon had no rival, while as promoter and stage-manager of Gray's Inn revels, his knowledge of everything connected with the stage was extensive and practical. Bacon's acknowledged writings contain more allusions to the stage and acting than are to be found in the Shakespeare plays.

How triumphantly the Stratfordians would have pointed to this sonnet, if it had been included among Shakespeare's!—

What is our life? The play of passion.
Our mirth? The music of division.
Our mothers' wombs the tiring-houses be
When we are dressed for life's short comedy.
The earth, the stage; Heaven the spectator is,
Who sits and views whoso'er doth act amiss.
The graves which hide us from the scorching sun
Are like drawn curtains when the play is done.
Thus playing, post we to our latest rest,
And then we die in earnest, not in jest.

"Only an actor could have written that!" they would gleefully exclaim. But, unfortunately for their argument, the sonnet was written by Raleigh, who was not a player and had no connection with the stage.

Yours faithfully PROSPERO.

To the Editor, BACONIANA. 21*st August* 1945.

THE DATE OF "SHAKE-SPEARE'S" SONNETS.

Dear Sir

Mr. Eagle, in his letter under the above heading in BACONIANA for January, 1945, writes of an entry in Alleyn's Diary which shows that the sonnets were on sale in 1609. There is no entry in Alleyn's Diary for June, 1609. There is only a note *attributed* to Alleyn written on one of Alleyn's letters, which is *not dated*, the note having the date June 29th, but the year is not added. The handwriting of this note is in quite a different hand from the other notes and may be a forgery, as Alleyn's Diary contains a number of forgeries written in by someone. The fact that the number 1609 appears at the bottom of the first page of the Sonnets proves nothing—at least nine of the title pages of the "Shakespeare" Quartos have been proved to be falsely dated. In the copy of Shakespeare's Sonnets in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, someone has altered the date to 1624, which is much more likely to be the correct date of publication. Mr. Eagle assumes that the demand for this book would be small. Why? In 1609 everything supposed to have been written by "Shakespeare" was in great demand and the quartos of the plays were reprinted over and over again. How is it that this book was not reprinted until 1640—36 years after the death of the supposed author? If it was published in 1609, how is it that we can find no reference anywhere to this book between the years 1609 and 1624? This uncanny silence can only be accounted for by the fact that Shakespeare's Sonnets were not in existence in 1609. "Shakespeare's works were pirated wholesale, with the sole exception of the Sonnets. In the opinion of some people, certain of the sonnets contain evidence of personal immorality. Is it likely that these would have gone unnoticed in Elizabethan times, when anything of this kind would be at once seized on by critics or personal enemies of the supposed author? The fact that the title of a book was entered on the Stationer's Register does not necessarily mean that it was published; the entry could be made simply to safeguard an author's right to the title registered. Mr. Eagle says that Drummond had a copy of this book because in one of his own sonnets, published in 1616, he uses phrases found in "A Lover's Complaint," printed at the end of the Sonnets. Why should "Shakespeare" not have borrowed from Drummond instead of Drummond from Shakespeare?

Drummond was Scotland's leading sonneteer and poet, and in 1614 prepared a list of all the English books bought by him up to that year, but there is no mention of "Shakespeare's Sonnets," 1609, in that list. Surely if he had a copy he would have mentioned it? In the Sonnets are distinct references to public incidents which occurred in 1620-21, so the author could not have been Will Shaksper, who had died in 1616 and was unable to prognosticate events which did not take place until four years after his death.

Yours faithfully,

EDWARD D. JOHNSON.

To the Editor, BACONIANA.

THE HIDDEN MEANING OF THE TITLE PAGES OF ARCADIA, ETC.

Sir,

In BACONIANA (July, 1945) Mr. Eagle produces much evidence to prove that the plant in question shewn in *Arcadia* is intended to be Marjoram, which may be right in this case, but the boar has been depicted elsewhere in connection with other plants, see Oct., 1944, number, where, on page 156a (103) it is certainly not Marjoram, and page 156b (58), where the flowers are distinctly roses.

The motto "Non Tibi Spiro" (I breathe not for thee) appears to have been chosen deliberately, as, in Numerical Cipher, used by Bacon, it equals "*I Queen Elizabeth*," she stands in the way, as always during her lifetime, of any advancement for Francis to high positions. Mr. Eagle remarks that the two figures represent Musidorus and Zelmane in the novel, the latter really being Pyrocles, a man disguised as a woman; the description in *Arcadia* agrees fairly with this, although Musidorus has no "long cloke" and the difficulty as to the face of Zelmane is overcome by making it that of a woman; this idea of the disguise which could deceive nobody is a very weak part of the novel, and of the illustration also. The bear and lion are full-sized animals and not only "a paw and head," as the French Edition is said to shew, nor are they being attacked, but have quite happy expressions.

However, all these superficial descriptions do not in the least dispose of the arguments in favour of the "Royal birth," while those able to read between the lines at that time, and now, consider that the figures really represent, under necessary camouflage, Queen Elizabeth and her husband, the Earl of Leicester, with their legitimate son Francis between them, identified by the head of the boar; also through the motto, the whole group confirming the very numerous references to the same subject in contemporary literature.

The same figures are again used on the Title Page of the 1611 Ed. of *The Fairie Queen and Shepheards Calendar* and the description in the October "Æglogue" and Glosse in the *Shepheardes Calender*, 1579, actually agrees with the identity of the two figures in the Title Pages, that one is the Queen, and the other "the worthy whom she loveth best," viz., The Earl of Leicester, with the bear his distinctive badge ("Cognisance"). (Worthy=R. Dudley (SH) numerical cipher.)

The casual reader thinks that the two figures represent characters in the novel only, and Mr. Eagle apparently makes the same mistake.

As to the mysterious "H.S." and his identity, Aubrey, Hoskins, Nashe and Florio, all seem very doubtful about this. They hint that he was connected in some way with the authorship of *Arcadia*; if it should be Francis Bacon, who was normally related to the Sidneys, it would explain the extraordinary dying wish of Philip that his MSS. of *Arcadia* should be destroyed, being aware that the part ascribed to him was not his own composition; it would also supply the reason why his devoted sister Mary did not carry out his wish, the real author of all or part would probably object to the destruction. It should be noted that H.S.=FRA.B. in numerical cipher.

That the *Arcadia*, when published, was popular is well known, and the Countess of Pembroke's name would carry much weight, but English Novels were not then very numerous and mostly translations from foreign authors, such as *Painter's Palace of Pleasure*, etc.; they were written only for the educated class and the ignorant public would not have a look-in. The intention of the Titl ePage device is clearly not meant to indicate that the book is "Caviare to the general," which would be unnecessary. The whole novel is so cleverly interwoven in its delineation of character and involved ideas that it does not bear the appearance of hasty writing on loose slips of paper, but was evidently composed and arranged by a master mind; neither Philip nor Mary can come under that designation.

There is still much to be discovered in this clever work, with many clues to its hidden authorship: for instance, the Author's apparent name SIDNEI; 40 (SH)=Francis, and it must be remembered that numerical ciphers (unlike some others) are *certain* and cannot be disputed; their frequent use by Bacon is surely intentional.

The quotation from Nashe's *Lenten Stuffe* is very enlightening; he refers undoubtedly to the Title Page of the *Faerie Queen and Shepheardе's Calendar* (1611) and to the glosse in the anonymous *Shepheardе's Calendar* (1579); he addresses all lovers of poetry from the unlearned (uninstructed) to one equal to "H. S. Prince" (Bacon?), who gives honour to *Maid Marian*=Queen Eliza (S.H.) and on the Title Page puts a pig to represent some great personage (Bacon?) also picturing a sweet Marjoram for his "Empresse" (Queen Elizabeth) adding a free rendering of the motto, *Non Tibi Spiro*, to enforce the whole reference. Shakespeare in *Winter's Tale* identifies Marjoram with Marigold and Lucretius seems to infer that it was a restorative, while Florio recommends "a plaister of dried marjoram," but he may have been deriding the old Queen Elizabeth, and Coleridge was probably "instructed" as to double meanings and could translate "*Sum caltha*" as "I am a boar" (in S.H. numerical cipher). The addition of the motto seems to confirm this.

The Editorial (July, 1945), p. 86-88, on this subject should be carefully read, it is of great interest, especially as indicating that this particular illustrated Title Page appears in several other books, which may possibly be found to have some connection with Francis Bacon. Many other explanations are also given by the Editor which throw considerable light on the subject.

This Title Page now discloses to us very strong evidence of the authorship of *The Shepheardе's Calendar*, *The Faerie Queen*, and *Arcadia*, also confirmation of the Baconian opinion as to the Royal birth of Francis Bacon, with all that it entails for the understanding of his character and career. It could now have no dynastic bearing, nor reason for continued secrecy concerning this truly great man.

Yours faithfully, PERCY WALTERS.

31, Arundel Road,
CHEAM.
12th May, 1945.

To the Editor, BACONIANA.

ALLEYN AND THE SONNETS.

Sir,

The only point in Mr. Percy Walters' letter, concerning my defence of the Title Page date of the Sonnets, which calls for further explanation on my part, is the suggestion that the entry in Alleyn's Diary of the purchase of a copy for 5d. may be a forgery.

The note is made on the back of a letter addressed to Alleyn by one Thomas Bowker, dated "Rowhampton, 19 June (1609)." Bowker wrote to Alleyn entreating him to send by the bearer a "mastife whelpe."

I always take care to verify my statements before committing them to print, for I have always considered that speculative argument, unsupported by evidence, does not help to arrive at the truth, but, on the other hand, confuses the issue. I did not neglect, therefore, to get in contact with the librarian of Dulwich College in order to clear up any possibility of a forged entry on the part of Payne Collier. Warner's Catalogue of the MSS. at Dulwich (1881) excluded Collier's forgeries. Warner had made himself thoroughly familiar with Collier's falsifications, but no suspicion was attached by him, or by any other authority, to this entry, which is the last of some notes of payment under the headings "purchase," "rent," "lawe," "aparell" and "Howshould Stuff." As the other payments mentioned can be proved, by reference to the MSS. and Muniments at Dulwich, to have been made in the early part of 1609, there is certainly no reason to doubt that the note as to the purchase of the Sonnets for 5d. also applies to 1609. It would have been little short of a miracle if Collier had happened to have forged such a note in a place where previous entries have, subsequently to Collier's death, been traced to the year 1609. Bowker did not state the year on his letter. Collier would also have been astonishingly lucky in entering the price as 5d., for that happens to be the figure written in the Rylands Library copy in a contemporary hand.

May I again assure your correspondent that I am very wide awake when considering any document to which Collier had access? If this entry had not been above suspicion, and capable of being substantiated, I should not have mentioned it.

Yours faithfully,
R. L. EAGLE.